arXiv:1301.4695v1 [physics.class-ph] 20 Jan 2013

Minimalist's Electromagnetism

Y. Sobouti
Institute for Advanced Studies in Basic Sciences (IASBS)
Gava Zang, Zanjan 45137-66731, Iran
email: sobouti@iasbs.ac.ir

That the universal constancy of the speed of light is a logical consequence of Maxwell's equations is common knowledge. Here we show that the converse is also true. That is, electromagnetism (EM) and electrodynamics (ED) in all their details can be derived from the simple assumption that the speed of light is a universal constant. The consequences reach far. Conventional EM and ED are observation based. The alternative we propose spares all observational foundations of EM, only to reintroduce them as theoretically derived and empiricism-free laws of Nature. Simplicity is beauty and there are merits to it. For instance, if $\nabla.\mathbf{B}=0$ emerges as a theoretical demand of the formalism, then nonexistence of magnetic monopoles will be a proven theorem and a reality. Or, if Poisson's equation is derived from some first principles, then the inverse square law of Coulomb force becomes an exact law as long as the accepted first principles are tenable.

PACS numbers: 03.30.+p, 03.50.De, 11.30, 41.20q

I. INTRODUCTION

Electromagnetism as we know it today is founded on the laboratory findings of Coulomb, Ampere, Faraday, and many other experimenters. Encapsulated in Maxwell's equations [1], EM is a robust edifice that has stood the tests of the most rigorous experimental scrutinies and the deepest conceptual criticisms of the past 150 years, since its first announcement in 1865. Observation based beginnings, however, have an Achilles' heel. What if there are escapees from observations, which if detected might radically change one's view of Nature. The question of magnetic monopoles is one such case. So far, all natural and manmade magnets are found to be dipoles. And all magnetic field producing electric currents are found to close on themselves and form a loop. Hence, one has concluded that the magnetic field is divergence free. But what if there is one magnetic monopole somewhere in the universe, and what if such supposition is expounded and theorized by scientists of Dirac's reputation[2]? Are there limits to such a legitimate scientific prudence?

In what follows we show that there is a reciprocity between the formal mathematical structure of EM and ED on the one hand, and the universal constancy of the speed of light on the other. One implies the other. This may sound bizarre, for it is easy to conceive a simple constant to be derivable from a complex multi-component structure. But how can the multi-component EM and ED in all their sophistication be produced from the simple notion that c is a universal constant? Nonetheless, we show that it is the case.

II. MINIMALIST'S ELECTROMAGNETISM

By the end of the 19th Century the physics community had realized that the speed of light in moving media did not obey the Galilean law of addition of velocities. All laboratory and astronomical observations attempting to detect the motion of light emitting sources, light detecting devices, and light propagating media, through experiments using the light itself, yielded negative results [3]. Einstein promoted this conclusion to the status of an axiom that *the speed of light is a universal constant.* An immediate corollary to this first principle is the invariance of the spacetime intervals, which in inertial frames is expressed by

$$c^2d\tau^2 = c^2dt^2 - dx^2 - dy^2 - dz^2 = \eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu, lmetric \tag{2.1}$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ is the Minkowski metric tensor. It will also be used to lower and raise the vector and tensor indices.

Equation (**??**) is our departing point. Assume a test particle at the spacetime coordinate x^λ of mass m, 4-velocity $U^\mu = dx^\mu/d\tau$, and kinetic 4-momentum $p^\mu(x^\lambda) = mU^\mu$. Defined as such, p^μ has a constant norm, $|p_\mu p^\mu|^{1/2} = mc$, irrespective of whether the particle is accelerated or not. Our second assumption is *the test particle can be accelerated*, a common sense notion. Hence

$$\frac{dp_\mu}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial p_\mu}{\partial x^\nu}\frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial p_\mu}{\partial x^\nu}U^\nu = eF_{\mu\nu}(x^\lambda)U^\nu. \tag{2.2}$$

Here p_μ is a function of the spacetime coordinates on particle's orbit, that is, $p_\mu(x^\lambda(\tau))$. The third equality in Eq.(2.2) is the definition of $F_{\mu\nu}$,

$$eF_{\mu\nu} = \partial p_\mu/\partial x^\nu, \tag{2.3}$$

where e is a constant introduced for later convenience. Both sides of Eq. ($\mathring{\text{d}}$eff) are also defined on particle's orbits. But orbits can be any and every orbit. Therefore, one is allowed to consider $F_{\mu\nu}(x^\lambda)$ a function of the spacetime coordinates without reference to any specific orbit, and identify it with the field responsible for the acceleration of the particle.

The norm of p^μ is constant. We multiply Eq. (2.2) by p^μ and find

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{d\tau}(p_\mu p^\mu) = \frac{e}{m}F_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Equation (2.4) implies the antisymmetry of $F_{\mu\nu}$ (otherwise the invariance of the norm of the 4-vector p^μ in inertial frames of reference will be violated). Hence

$$F_{\mu\nu} = -F_{\nu\mu}, \quad tr\ F = 0, \qquad F_{\lambda\lambda} = 0. \tag{2.5}$$

We differentiate $F_{\mu\nu}$ with respect to x^λ (hereafter denoted as $F_{\mu\nu,\lambda}$) and noting that, $F_{\mu\nu,\lambda} = F_{\mu\lambda,\nu} = \partial_\nu \partial_\lambda p_\mu$, we find

$$F_{\mu\nu,\lambda} + F_{\lambda\mu,\nu} + F_{\nu\lambda,\mu} = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

Next we go back to Eq. (2.2), raise its indices, and separate its time and space components,

$$\frac{dp^0}{d\tau} = eF^{0i}U_i, \tag{2.7}$$

$$\frac{dp^i}{d\tau} = e(F^{i0}U_0 + F^{ij}U_j). \tag{2.8}$$

There are three components to each of F^{0i} and F^{ij}. We denote them by

$$F^{0i} = -F^{i0} = -E_i. \tag{2.9}$$

$$F^{ij} = \varepsilon^{ijk}B_k. \tag{2.10}$$

The explicit form of $F^{\mu\nu}$ in terms of E and B is

$$F^{\mu\nu} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -E_1 & -E_2 & -E_3 \\ E_1 & 0 & B_3 & -B_2 \\ E_2 & -B_3 & 0 & B_1 \\ E_3 & B_2 & -B_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} .lfmunu \tag{2.11}$$

Part of the job is done. On identifying E and B with the familiar electric and magnetic vectors, one will recognize Eq. (h̊omo) as the homogenous pair of Maxwell's equations, Eq. (f̊munu) as the field tensor of EM. And Eqs. (4̊mom), (e̊nergy) and (3̊mom) will be found to be the equations of motion of a particle of charge e under the Lorentz force.

For pedagogical reasons to be referred to below, we write the Lorentz force equation for a continuous distribution of charged particles. Assume a unit 3-volume located at x^λ, filled with particles of masses m_a, charges e_a, and 4-velocities U^μ_a. Summing Eq. (4̊mom) over all particles in the assmed unit volume gives

$$\frac{dP^\mu}{d\tau} = F^{\mu\nu}J_\nu, \tag{2.12}$$

where

$$P^\mu = \sum_a p^\mu_a, = \sum_a m_a U^\mu_a, \text{ 4-momentum density,}$$

$$\text{and} \quad J^\nu = \sum_a e_a U^\nu_a, \text{ 4-charge-current density.}$$

Up to this stage we have discussed kinematics, only. Dynamics comes in when we ask for the cause of EM fields. We argue that the EM field acts on the charge-current density to exert a force on the particles, Eq. (2.12). Logically there should be reactions from the charge-current on the field. The issue is best resolved by assuming that some J^ν, not necessarily the same in Eq. (b̊ulkl), is the source of the EM field. We note that J^ν is a divergence free 4-vector. From the field, $F^{\mu\nu}{}_{,\nu}$ is also divergence free and a 4-vector. Our third assumption is *the two 4-vectors are proportional to each other.* Thus,

$$F^{\mu\nu}{}_{,\nu} = \frac{4\pi}{c}J^\mu \quad \text{with} \quad J^\mu{}_{,\mu} = 0.lnonhomo \tag{2.13}$$

Equation (n̊onhomo) is the non-homogenous pair of Maxwell's equation and expresses the dynamics of the EM fields. The factor $4\pi/c$ is introduced to indicate that we are using Gaussian Units. Before discussing conclusions, however, let us look at some history.

A bibliographical note: Derivation of the homogenous pair of Maxwell's equations, without reference to their observational foundations has precedence. Dyson [6] recounts an unpublished work of Feynman from 1948, in which he derived the homogenous EM equations beginning with Newton's law of motion and Dirac-like commutation brackets between the coordinates x^i and and velocities $\dot{x}^i$. Hughes [7] examines Dyson's recount and concludes that any hamiltonian system with a force law dependent on coordinates and velocities, but not on accelerations, leads to Maxwell-like homogenous equations and to the gauge freedom associated with them. Lorentz force satisfies this requirement. But so dose the (centrifugal + Coriolis) force on a satellite orbiting a planet, or the force on an object in the weak gravitational field of a rotating body with a spacetime metric field ($g_{\mu\nu} = 1 + h_{00}, -1, -1, -1$, and h_{0i}). In the latter case one is lead to Sanyac effect.

III. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We summarize the logic we have followed in this paper. Conventionally, EM and ED are built on Coulomb's law, Ampere's law, Faraday's law, and the fact that all magnets found in Nature are dipoles. To these, Maxwell adds his displacement current to conform with the continuity of charge-current density, six experimentally deduced laws in all. These empirical deductions are then promoted to the status of founding principles and EM and ED are formulated. The universal constancy of c is one of the theoretically derived theorems of so formulated EM. Here, we reverse the order of the suppositions and conclusions. Our founding principles, also observation based, are:

speed of light is a universal constant, and

there are particles prone to acceleration, common sense.

We find that the spacetime should necessarily be pervaded by the unique rank 2 antisymmetric tensor field of EM. And the force on a test particle of charge e should necessarily and uniquely be the Lorentz force.

Up to this stage we deal with kinematics of EM only. Even Eq. (4̊mom), before identifying the right hand side of it with Lorentz force, is a kinematical relation. In particular, the space component of Eq. (h̊omo), $\nabla.\mathbf{B} = 0$, is a kinematical property of EM field and rules out the existence of magnetic monopoles on kinematical grounds; a point that might interest those who entertain the existence of magnetic monopoles. See Milton, on '*Theoretical and experimental status of magnetic monopoles*' [4].

Dynamics is introduced through our third assumption, *charge-current density is the source of EM field.*

There follows the non-homogenous pair of Maxwell's equations, one of which is the time component of Eq. (n̊onhomo), $\nabla.\mathbf{E} = 4\pi\rho$. From this, one immediately concludes that the Coulomb force between two charged particles is exactly $1/r^2$; an assurance for those concerned with the degree of accuracy of Coulomb's law, see e.g., Plimpton et al. [5].

For whatever it might be worth, let us note that of the last two equations we have commented on, one has a kinematical character, and the other a dynamical nature. They are not on a par to tempt one to insert a *magnetic charge-current density* into the right hand side of Eq. (2.6) on symmetry grounds between $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$.

It is noteworthy that of the two founding principles of the special theory of relativity, constant c and same laws of physics in all inertial frames, only the fist one is used in our formalism. The invariance of EM and ED in inertial frames has followed automatically without reference to the second principle. It seems, at least in the case of EM and ED, the second principle is a conclusion from the first.

A logician would advise that if A implies B and B implies A, then A and B are equivalent. Any information contained in A should also be found in B. Yet it is still thought provoking how three simple propositions, two of which are everyday observations, can lead to a complex and multi-component structure like EM. One wonders how resourceful is this simple statement that 'the speed of light is a universal constant'. Have we mastered all intricacies of the constant c? Are other constants of nature as resourceful as c?

The path for inclusion of gravitation in EM formalism is paved. It is sufficient to begin with a curved spacetime expressed by a metric tensor, $g_{\mu\nu}$, instead of the constant tensor, $\eta_{\mu\nu}$, and arrive at Maxwell's equations in the presence of gravitation.

Pedagogics and mnemonics of the formalism should not be overlooked. One is enabled to derive the whole EM and ED on a sheet of a notebook and memorize them with relative ease.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Author wishes to thank M. R. Khajehpour, S. Shiekh Jabbari, A. R. Valizade, and B. Farnudi for fruitful discussions and suggestions. h

---

[1] Maxwell, J. C., A Dynamical Theory of Electromagnetic Fields, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc.,**155**, 459, 1865.

[2] Dirac, P. A. M., Proc. R. Soc. London, **A 133**, 1931; Phys. Rev. **74**, 1948.

[3] Resource Letter on Relativity, Am J. Phys.,**30**, 462,1963.

[4] Milton, K. A., arXiv:hep-ex10602040.

[5] Plimpton, S. J.; Lawton, W. E., Phys. Rev. **50**, 1066, 1936.

[6] Dyson, F. J., Am. J. Phys. **58** (3), 209, 1990.

[7] Hughes, R. J., Am. J. Phys., **60** (4), 301, 1992.